

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KEVIN TYRONE HAIRSTON,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
R. ARCHIE, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:23-cv-0900-CKD P

ORDER

Plaintiff filed a document titled “Motion on Time...” which the court construes as a motion for an extension of time to oppose defendants’ motion for summary judgment filed on January 3, 2025. Plaintiff is hereby informed that pursuant to Local Rule 230(l), plaintiff’s opposition to the motion for summary judgment was due no later than 21 days after the date of service of the motion. As plaintiff was previously advised, all motions for summary judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 shall be briefed pursuant to Local Rule 230(l) and failure to timely oppose such a motion may be deemed a waiver of opposition to the motion. (ECF No. 2 at 6.) The court additionally cautions plaintiff that further requests for an extension of time for this purpose will require a detailed showing of good cause. With this admonition in place, the court will grant plaintiff an extension of time to oppose defendants’ motion for summary judgment.

////

1 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

2 1. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 30) is GRANTED; and  
3 2. Plaintiff is granted thirty days from the date of this order in which to file an opposition  
4 or statement of non-opposition to defendants' motion for summary judgment.

5 Dated: February 24, 2025



6  
7 CAROLYN K. DELANEY  
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

8, hair0900.36oppo